arXiv:1601.02552v1 [math.AP] 11 Jan 2016

,

ON A VARIATIONAL PROBLEM RELATED TO NLS ON HYPERBOLIC SPACE

CHENJIE FAN [‡] [†] AND PETER KLEINHENZ[♯]

Abstract. Motivated by NLS, We study a variational problem on hyperbolic space. In particular, we compute its minimum value and we show the minimizer does not exist.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Statement of problem and results.** In this short note, we consider the following minimizing problem on 3D hyperbolic space:

$$\begin{cases} J(f) := \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f)}{\|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}}, f \in H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3), \\ E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f) < E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q), \\ \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

Here

$$E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f) := \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - \frac{1}{6}\|f\|^6_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \quad E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q) := \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla Q\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} - \frac{1}{6}\|Q\|^6_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)},$$

$$H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3) := \{f \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3); f \text{ is radial}\},$$

and Q is the ground state on Euclidean space, i.e. the unique positive $\dot{H}^1$ radial solution to[1]

$$\Delta W + W^5 = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

We show

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega \subset H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3)$ be defined as*

$$\Omega := \{f | f \in H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3), f \neq 0, E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f) < E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q), \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}\}.$$

Then we have

$$\inf_{f \in \Omega} J(f) = \frac{1}{2} \tag{1.3}$$

[‡]Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139-4307 USA. email: cjfan@math.mit.edu.

[†] The author is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1069225, DMS 1362509 and DMS 1462401.

[♯] Northwestern University, Department of Mathematics, 2033 Sheridan Rd, Evanston Il, 60201 USA. email:pbk@math.northwestern.edu.

[1]When one talks about positive solutions, there is no difference between $|W|^4 W$ and W^5.

1.2. **Motivation.** We are interested in J because of its connection to the focusing energy critical NLS on hyperbolic space:

$$\begin{cases} iu_t + \Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3} u = -|u|^4 u, \\ u_0 \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3). \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

Motivated by the seminal result of Kenig and Merle, [KM06], one might want to show the following:

Conjecture 1.2 (formal conjecture)**.** *Let u be the solution to* (1.4)*, such that*

$$E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) < E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(Q_*), \quad \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} Q_*\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)},$$

where Q_* is the unique[2] *$H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ positive solution to the ground state equation on hyperbolic space*

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3} Q_* + Q_*^5 = 0.$$

Then u is global and scatters in the sense that

$$\|u(t,x)\|_{L^{10}_{\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{H}^3}} \lesssim 1. \tag{1.5}$$

This conjecture, seemingly natural, is not even correctly stated. As shown in [MS08], there is no nontrivial $H^1(H^3)$ positive solution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3} f + \lambda f + f^5 = 0, \\ f \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3), \lambda \in \mathbf{R}. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Let us reconsider the NLS on hyperbolic space. Roughly speaking, the road map suggested by [KM06] has three ingredients:

(1) Variational inequality/ energy trapping argument.
(2) Concentration compactness/profile decomposition.
(3) Rigidity argument.

In the case of NLS on 3D hyperbolic space, the variational inequality, which is related to the ground state in Euclidean case, seems to collapse at first glance since there is no ground state here. Concentration compactness is fine, see [IPS12]. The rigidity argument, which is related to virial identity, is much more complicated than in the Euclidean space.

However, one can make the observation that the variational inequality argument in [KM06] is only related to the fact that some of the ground state's norms can be expressed in terms of the best constant for the Sobolev inequality. Thus one possible way to modify Conjecture 1.2 is the following:

Conjecture 1.3. *Let u be the solution to* (1.4) *, such that*

$$E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) < E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q), \quad \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{1.7}$$

where Q is the unique positive $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ radial solution to the ground state equation on Euclidean space

$$\Delta Q + Q^5 = 0.$$

Then u is global and scatters in the sense that

$$\|u(t,x)\|_{L^{10}_{\mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{H}^3}} \lesssim 1. \tag{1.8}$$

[2]In hyperbolic space, $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ and $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ are the same space.

One potential obstacle to prove this result is Banica's result [Ban07], which implies the following:

Theorem 1.4. *Assume $u_0 \in H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3)$, such that*

$$E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) < \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \|ru_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \infty.$$

Let u be the solution to (1.4) *with initial data u_0, then u must blow up in finite time.*

So before attempting to prove Conjecture 1.3, one would like to know if the condition (1.7) excludes the case $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) < \frac{1}{2}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$.

This is our motivation for studying the minimizing problem of the functional J, and our main theorem gives a positive answer.

Remark 1.5. *If one is familiar with the results of* [KM06] *and the profile decomposition in the hyperbolic space* [IPS12]*, then one should be able to follow the argument in* [IPS12] *to show all data described in Conjecture 1.3 generates global solutions, which indeed implies our Theorem. Nevertheless, we will give a self contained proof, which is independent of the NLS. Note, the truly subtle problem, is to show the data described in Conjecture 1.3 will scatter. To show this, one will need some new computation related to virial identity. We do not discuss this matter here. One may see* [BD14] *and the reference in that article for this direction.*

1.3. **Notations.** We view the 3D hyperbolic space in polar coordinates (r, w) with Lorenzian metric on $\mathbf{R}^4$

$$ds^2 = dr^2 + \sinh^2 r d\omega^2, \tag{1.9}$$

with the volume element

$$\int_{\mathbf{H}^3} u(x)d\Omega = \int_0^\infty \int_{S^2} u(r,\omega)\sinh^2 r\, d\omega dr. \tag{1.10}$$

We use the notation $u = u(x) = u(|x|) = u(r)$ for any radial function u. Note with the usual polar coordinates in $\mathbf{R}^3$, any function in hyperbolic space can also be naturally regarded as a function in Euclidean space. We use $\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3}$ to denote the co-variant derivative on hyperbolic space and we use ∇ to denote the usual gradient on Euclidean space. We write $A \lesssim B$ when $A \leq CB$, for some universal constant C, we write $A \gtrsim B$ if $B \lesssim A$. We write $A \sim B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$.

1.4. **Preliminary.**

1.4.1. *Sobolev embedding.* We quote Sobolev embedding results for $\mathbf{R}^3$ and $\mathbf{H}^3$. First by Aubin [Aub76]

Lemma 1.6. *Let $u \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ then*

$$||u||_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \leq C_3||\nabla u||_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{1.11}$$

Moreover, if $||u||_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = C_3||\nabla u||_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}$ and $u \neq 0$ then u is a solution to (1.2)

Second by Hebey [Heb00]

Lemma 1.7. *Let $u \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ then*

$$||u||_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} \leq C_3||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \tag{1.12}$$

where C_3 is the same constant as in Lemma 1.6.

We emphasize that the constants C_3 in (1.12) and (1.11) are the same.

1.4.2. *Variational inequality and energy trapping.* We have the following lemma as in [KM06]

Lemma 1.8. *Assume*

$$||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < ||\nabla Q||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} \quad \textit{and} \quad E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u) < (1-\delta_0) E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q),$$

where $\delta_0 > 0$. Then there exists $\bar{\delta} = \bar{\delta}(\delta_0) > 0$ such that

$$||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < (1-\bar{\delta})||\nabla Q||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}, \tag{1.13}$$

and

$$||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - ||u||^6_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \bar{\delta}||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \tag{1.14}$$

and in particular

$$E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u) \gtrsim ||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}. \tag{1.15}$$

Proof. From the proof of the Lemma 3.4 in [KM06] we have that

$$||\nabla Q||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} = \frac{1}{C_3^3} \quad \text{and} \quad E(Q) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\right) ||\nabla Q||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} = \frac{1}{3C_3^3}, \tag{1.16}$$

where C_3 is the best constant for the Sobolev inequality for $\mathbf{R}^3$. The remainder of the proof is almost identical to that of Lemma 3.4 of [KM06], we quickly review it. We consider the function

$$f_1(y) = \frac{1}{2}y - \frac{C_3^6}{6}y^3,$$

which if we plug in $||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$ by (1.12) and (1.11) is less than or equal to $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u)$. This along with the fact that f is strictly increasing for $0 < y < 1/C_3^3$ and that $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u) < (1-\delta_0)E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q)$ gives us (1.13).

We also consider

$$g_1(y) = y - C_3^6 y^3,$$

which, if we again plug in $||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||_{L^2}$, by (1.12) and (1.11) is less than or equal to $\int_{\mathbf{H}^3} |\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u|^2 - |u|^6$. We note that $g'(y)$ is bounded below by -2 for $0 < y < 1/C_3^3$ which along with (1.13) gives us a lower bound on $g(y)$ on the same interval in terms of $||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$ which shows (1.14).

Once we have (1.14), then (1.15) follows directly as

$$E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u) = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{6}\right) ||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} + \frac{1}{6}\left(||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - ||u||^6_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)}\right) \geq C_{\bar{\delta}} ||\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}.$$

□

1.4.3. *Profile decomposition on Euclidean space.* We recall the profile decomposition on Euclidean space:

Lemma 1.9. *Let u_k be a sequence of bounded radial $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ functions, then (up to replacement by a subsequence), one can find $\{v_j; \{\lambda_{j,k}\}_k\}_j$ where v_j is a radial $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ function and $\lambda_{j,k} \in \mathbf{R}_+$, such that for any $J \geq 1$,*

$$u_k(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,k}^{1/2}} v_j\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{j,k}}\right) + R_{J,k}, \tag{1.17}$$

and the following holds:

- *$j \neq j'$ implies $\lim_{k\to\infty} |\ln(\lambda_{j,k}/\lambda_{j,k'})| = \infty$.*

- *For any fixed J,* $\|u_k\|^2_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} = \sum_{j=1}^J \|v_j\|^2_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + \|R_{J,k}\|^2_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)} + o_k(1)$.
- $\lim_{J\to\infty} \limsup_{k\to\infty} \|R_{J,k}\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0$

We say u_k admits a profile decomposition with $\{v_j; \{\lambda_{j,k}\}_k\}_j$, and we call v_j a profile.

See [Gér98], [Ker01] for a proof.

1.5. **A nonexistence result for an elliptic PDE.**

Lemma 1.10. *There is no positive solution to*

$$\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3} u + u^5 + \lambda u = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{1.18}$$

in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$.

See [MS08] for a proof. We point out, by standard techniques from elliptic equations, one can upgrade the above lemma to

Lemma 1.11. *There is no non-negative solution to*

$$\Delta u + u^5 + \lambda u = 0, \quad \lambda \in \mathbf{R}, \tag{1.19}$$

in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)\backslash\{0\}$.

We will prove Lemma 1.11 in Appendix B.

2. Proof of main result

2.1. **No minimizer can exist.** We first show no element in $\overline{\Omega}\backslash\{0\}$ can minimize J.

2.1.1. *No minimizer can exist in the interior of Ω.* We show

Lemma 2.1. *There does not exist $u_0 \in \Omega$ such that $J(u_0) = \inf_{u\in\Omega} J(u)$.*

Proof. We first point out that we can assume u_0 is non-negative, since $J(|u_0|) \leq J(u_0)$. Then, we compute the Euler-Lagrange equation for the minimizer and we get for some $\lambda_0 \in \mathbf{R}$

$$\Delta u_0 + u_0^5 + \lambda_0 u_0 = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

which contradicts Lemma 1.11. □

2.1.2. *No minimizer can exist on the boundary of Ω.* We show

Lemma 2.2. *There does not exist $u_0 \in \partial\Omega$ with $u_0 \neq 0$ such that $J(u) = \inf_{u\in\Omega} J(u)$*

Proof. Again we assume u_0 non-negative. There are three cases:

(1) $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)}, E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) < E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q)$.
(2) $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2}(\mathbf{R}^3), E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) = E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q)$.
(3) $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = \|\nabla Q\|_{L^2}(\mathbf{R}^3), E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_0) = E_{\mathbf{R}^3}(Q)$.

If case 1 holds, then by Lagrangian multiplier one derive for some $\lambda_0 \in \mathbf{R}$

$$(1 + M_0\lambda_0)\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_0 + u_0^5 + 2J(u_0)u_0 = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

where $M_0 := ||u_0||^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$.

If $1 + M_0\lambda_0 \leq 0$, then multiply both sides of (2.2) by u_0 and integrate, one gets $u_0 \equiv 0$. If $1 + M_0\lambda_0 > 0$, one can consider the equation for $\tilde{u}_0 := (\frac{1}{1+M_0\lambda_0})u_0$ and then argue as the proof of Lemma 2.1 to show $\tilde{u}_0 \equiv 0$.

If case 2 holds, by again using Lagrangian multiplier, one can derive an equation for u_0 and show that $u_0 \equiv 0$ as in the proof of Lemma 2.1.

Case 3 cannot hold. Indeed, if case 3 holds, then u_0 is the optimizer for the sharp Sobolev $\|u\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} \leq C^* \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$, then writing down its Euler-Lagrange equation, we get

$$\Delta u_0 + u_0^5 = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Again, by Lemma 1.11, $u_0 = 0$. Thus, case 3 cannot hold. □

2.2. **Main Proposition and proof for Theorem 1.1.** Theorem 1.1 mainly relies on the following proposition

Proposition 2.3. *Assume* $\inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f) < \frac{1}{2}$*, i.e. there exists a minimizing sequence* $u_k \in \Omega$*, such that* $\lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k) = \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0 \equiv \inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f)$*, and* $\sigma_0 > 0$*. Then there exists a function* $v \in \bar{\Omega}/\{0\}$*, such that* $J(v) = \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0$*.*

Let us assume the above Proposition temporarily and prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Step 1: $\inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Indeed, by studying the spectrum $-\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3}$, we know the smallest eigenvalue of $-\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3} = 1$, i.e.

(a):

$$\forall f \neq 0,\ \frac{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}}{\|f\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}} \geq 1.$$

(b):

$$\exists f_k, \|f_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 1,\ \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}}{\|f_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}} = 1.$$

Note by picking f_k as in (b), it is not hard to see $\lim_{k\to\infty} J(\frac{f_k}{k}) = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{f_k}{k} \in \Omega$ for large k.

Step 2: $J(f) \geq 0$. This follows directly from Lemma 1.8.

Step 3: Assume $\inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f) < \frac{1}{2}$, we apply Proposition 2.3 to get v such that $J(v) = \inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f)$, however, this contradicts Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2. □

All that is left is to prove is Proposition 2.3. We give two reminders before we start.

(1) Since we are in hyperbolic space, $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ is exactly $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$.
(2) A lot of limits are taken in this note, most arguments work only up to replacement by a subsequence, one may consider all the following arguments in which we take limits to only be valid up to replacement by a subsequence.

2.3. **Outline for the proof of Proposition 2.3.** Throughout this subsection ,we assume

Assumption 1. $\{u_k\}$ is a minimizing sequence in Ω, such that

$$J(u_k) \to \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0 \equiv \inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f), \quad \sigma_0 > 0. \tag{2.4}$$

The strategy for the proof is quite standard in variational arguments, the basic idea is that any minimizer cannot be split into two decoupled parts.

We first show u_k cannot converge to zero. To be precise, we have

Lemma 2.4. *Under Assumption 1, there is* $m_0 > 0$ *such that* $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq m_0 > 0$,
$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq m_0 > 0$.

See Subsection 2.4 for the proof.

Then we show no mass can escape to infinity, we have

Lemma 2.5. *Under Assumption 1, let χ be some fixed compactly supported bump function such that*

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, |x| \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0, |x| \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists R, such that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \left\| \left(1 - \chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right)\right) u_k \right\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \epsilon. \tag{2.5}$$

See Subsection 2.5 for the proof.

Then we show no mass concentrates near the origin, we have

Lemma 2.6. *Under Assumption 1, let χ be some fixed compactly supported bump function,*

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, |x| \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ 0, |x| \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists R, such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\chi(Rx)u_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} < \epsilon. \tag{2.6}$$

Finally, we use profile decomposition on Euclidean space to extract some non-trivial element minimizing our functional J, this is done in Subsection 2.7.

2.4. **Proof of Lemma 2.4.** We point out that once the first inequality is shown, the second inequality follows from Lemma A.3. Now let us show the first inequality. We will prove by contradiction. Without loss of generality (up to replacement by a sub-sequence), we assume all the $\liminf$, $\limsup$ are in fact $\lim$. If the first inequality does not hold, one has $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$. Since $J(u_k)$ is bounded, this implies that $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k) \xrightarrow{k} 0$. Thus, by energy trapping, Lemma 1.8, we have $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \to 0$, which of course is equivalent to $\|u_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \to 0$. This implies that $\liminf_{k\to} J(u_k) \geq \frac{1}{2}$ by Lemma A.3, a contradiction to $\lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k) = \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0 \equiv \inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f)$.

2.5. **Proof of Lemma 2.5.** We need the following lemma

Lemma 2.7. *Under Assumption 1, there exists a $R_0 \gg 1, \epsilon_0 \ll 1$, such that*

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \left\| \chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0}\right) u_k \right\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq 2\epsilon_0.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.7. We will show this by contradiction. Assume Lemma 2.7 does not hold, then up to replacement by a subsequence, one may assume

$$\left\| \chi\left(\frac{x}{k}\right) u_k \right\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \leq \frac{1}{k}.$$

By Sobolev embedding, we derive that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left\| \chi\left(\frac{x}{k}\right) u_k \right\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0.$$

By Hardy inequality, Lemma A.1, simply using pointwise control, we derive that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left\| \left(1-\chi\left(\frac{x}{k}\right)\right) u_k \right\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0.$$

Then since $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} > 0$ (Lemma 2.4), we have that (recall the smallest eigenvalue of $-\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3}$ is 1)

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_k\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}}{\|u_k\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \tag{2.7}$$

a contradiction to (2.4). □

Now we will prove Lemma 2.5 by contradiction. Assume (2.5) does not hold, then there exists a sequence of $\{R_k\}_k$ and $\epsilon_1 > 0$, such that (up to replacement by a subsequence)

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left\| \left(1-\chi\left(\frac{x}{R_k}\right)\right) u_k \right\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} > 2\epsilon_1, \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} R_k = \infty. \tag{2.8}$$

We can apply Lemma 2.7 to obtain $R_0 \gg 1, \epsilon_0 \ll 1$, such that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \left\| \chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0}\right) u_k \right\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq 2\epsilon_0.$$

Then by Lemma A.4, we can find a decomposition such that

- $u_k = f_{k,1} + f_{k_2} + r_k$.
- $u_k = f_{k,1}$ for $|x| \leq 2R_0$, $u_k = f_{k,2}$ for $|x| \geq \frac{R_k}{2}$.
- $f_{k,1}, f_{k,2}$ do not have common support for large k.
- $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \|r_k\| \leq \epsilon_2$. Here $\epsilon_2 \ll \min\{\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1\}$, and is a fixed small constant which will be chosen later.

Note it is not hard to see

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,1}\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \epsilon_0, \quad \liminf_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,2}\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \epsilon_1. \tag{2.9}$$

Also, the support condition between $f_{k,1}, f_{k,2}$ implies for large k that we have

$$|E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k) - E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) - E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2})| \lesssim \epsilon_2^2, \tag{2.10}$$

$$|\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_k\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,1}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}| \lesssim \epsilon_2^2. \tag{2.11}$$

We also remark that since R_k goes to ∞, $f_{k,2}$ is essentially located far away from the origin, so by Hardy inequality (A.1), we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,2}\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$. Thus, (up to replacement by a subsequence),

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}). \tag{2.12}$$

Thus, when ϵ_2 is small enough, (in particular, small enough compared to ϵ_0, ϵ_1), we have:

- By (2.11), there is some ϵ_3 which only relies on ϵ_1, ϵ_0, such that

$$\max(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{1,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{2,k}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}) < \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - \epsilon_3.$$

- By (2.10), and the fact that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} > 0,$$

  (see (2.9), (2.12)) there is ϵ_4 such that for large k, we have $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) < E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k) - \epsilon_4$,
- Thus, energy trapping (Lemma 1.8) holds for $f_{k,1}$ for large k, so there exists $c_0 = c_0(\epsilon_3, \epsilon_4)$, such that for large k, $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) \geq c_0 \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,1}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$.
- The above in turn (using (2.10)) shows for large k, $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) < E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k)$.

In particular, the above facts imply that for k large, $f_{k,1}, f_{k,2} \in \Omega$.

Remark 2.8. *The point is, essentially all our argument is quantitative, our choice of ϵ_3, ϵ_4 only depends on ϵ_0, ϵ_1 . Of course, ϵ_3, ϵ_4 depends on the fact that ϵ_2 is small, however, once ϵ_2 is smaller than some threshold determined by ϵ_0, ϵ_1, our choice of ϵ_3, ϵ_4 does not depend on the exact value of ϵ_2.*

We claim that we already have a contradiction. We discuss three different cases:

Case 1: $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$.

Then $J(u_k) = \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) + E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) + O(\epsilon_2^2)}{\|f_{k,2}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}} + o_k(1)$, which implies

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2})}{\|f_{k,2}\|^2_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)}} \leq \lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k) - \frac{\epsilon_0^2}{C} + C\epsilon_2^2, \tag{2.13}$$

where C is some universal large number. Therefore, when ϵ_2 is chosen small enough,

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} J(f_{k,2}) < \lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k) = \inf_{f\in\Omega} J(f). \tag{2.14}$$

A contradiction.

Case 2: $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,2}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$=0. A similar argument to Case 1 produces a contradiction.

Case 3: If both Case 1 and Case 2 do not occur, then we may assume $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = a_0 > 0$, and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,2}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = b_0 > 0$, We claim (again, up to replacement by a subsequence we assume all the limits exist)

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1})}{\|f_{k,1}\|} = \gamma < \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0 \equiv \lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k), \tag{2.15}$$

Which will give us a contradiction.

Let us prove (2.15) now. Let $\gamma := \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1})}{\|f_{k,1}\|}$. Since $\|f_{k,2}\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} \to 0$, thus

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2})}{\|f_{k,2}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}} \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

which gives us

$$\frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0 = \lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k) \geq \frac{a_0^2\gamma + \frac{1}{2}b_0^2}{a_0^2 + b_0^2} + O(\epsilon_2^2). \tag{2.16}$$

Thus, when ϵ_2 is small enough, $\gamma < \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0$, which is (2.15).

2.6. **Proof of Lemma 2.6.** Lemma 2.6 is an analogue of Lemma 2.5, and will be proved using Lemma A.5, the analogue of Lemma A.4.

Before we begin the proof, let us remark that for any $R \geq 1$, uniformly we have

$$\|\chi(Rx)h(x)\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \lesssim \|h\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \forall h \in H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3). \tag{2.17}$$

Now let us turn to the proof of the Lemma.

Proof of Lemma 2.6. We prove by contradiction. If Lemma 2.6 does not hold, then we would be able to find $R_k \xrightarrow{k\to\infty} \infty$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_0 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\chi(R_k x)u_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} > \tilde{\epsilon}_0. \tag{2.18}$$

We then claim that there is some $R_0 > 0$, $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3}[(1-\chi(R_0 x))u_k])\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \epsilon_1. \tag{2.19}$$

Indeed, if (2.19) does not hold for any $R_0, \epsilon_1 > 0$, one can find a sequence $\widetilde{R}_k \to \infty$ such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|(1-\chi(\widetilde{R}_k x))u_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$. Then $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \|\chi(\widetilde{R}_k x)u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$. This immediately contradicts Lemma 2.4 since by Hölder's inequality and the boundedness of $\{u_k\}$ in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$, one easily derives that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\chi(\widetilde{R}_k x)u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$. Thus (2.19) holds.

Now we apply Lemma A.5 and find a decomposition such that

- $u_k = f_{k,1} + f_{k,2} + r_k$
- $u_k = f_{k,1}$, for $|x| \geq \frac{1}{2R_0}$
- $u_k = f_{k,2}$, for $|x| \leq \frac{2}{R_k}$
- $f_{k,2}$ is supported in $|x| \leq \frac{2}{R'_k}$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} R'_k = \infty$.
- $\|r_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \leq \epsilon_2$ for large k, where ϵ_2 is some small constant to be chosen later.

Note we still have energy and L^2 gradient decoupling, so (2.10), (2.11) still hold.

Though the final value of ϵ_2 will be chosen at the very end of this subsection, we first require $\epsilon_2 < \frac{m_0}{2}$. This immediately implies $\limsup_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \frac{m_0}{2}$, since by Hölder's inequality and boundedness of $\{f_{k,2}\}$ in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|f_{k,2}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0.$$

Thus, up to replacement by a sub sequence, we obtain $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \gtrsim m_0$.

On the other hand, by (2.19), up to picking a sub sequence, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3}[\chi(R_k x)f_{k,2}]\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} > 0,$$

and so by (2.17), $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} > 0$. Thus, we may find some ϵ_1 such that $\min(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}) > \epsilon_1$. Now choose ϵ_2 at least smaller than $\frac{\epsilon_1}{2}$. By applying (2.11) we know there is some $\epsilon_3 > 0$, such that for large k,

$$\max(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}, \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}) < \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} - \epsilon_3.$$

Next we show for large k, there is an ϵ_4, such that

$$\max(E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}), E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2})) \leq E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k) - \epsilon_4.$$

When ϵ_2 is small enough, i.e. the error r_k is small enough, then up to picking a subsequence one may assume, for large $k, E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) > \frac{1}{3}E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k)$ or $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) > \frac{1}{3}E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k)$. Without loss of generality, we assume $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) > \frac{1}{3}E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k)$. This implies $E(f_{k,2}) < E(u_k) - \tilde{\epsilon}_4$ for some $\tilde{\epsilon}_4 > 0$. Thus $f_{k,2} \in \Omega$ and we can apply our energy trapping result, Lemma 1.8 on $f_{k,2}$. This gives us a lower bound $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) \gtrsim \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|^2_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \epsilon_1^2$, and so, when ϵ_2 is chosen even smaller, we can bound $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1})$ strictly above by $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k)$, by (2.10). Thus we confirm that we can find an ϵ_4 such that $\max(E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f, k_1), E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2})) \leq E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k) - \epsilon_4$. In particular for large k, $f_{k,1}, f_{k,2}$ are in Ω.

Now we claim $\lim_{k\to\infty} J(f_{k,1}) < \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0$, which is a contradiction. Indeed,

$$J(u_k) = \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(u_k)}{\|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}} = \frac{E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,1}) + E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) + O(\epsilon_2^2)}{\|f_{k,1}\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} + O(\epsilon_2^2)},$$

note that $E_{\mathbf{H}^3}(f_{k,2}) \gtrsim \|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f_{k,2}\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \geq \epsilon_1^2$, then choosing ϵ_2 small enough, and for large k, $J(f_{k,1}) < \lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k)$, making $\{f_{k,1}\}_k$ a better minimizing sequence which is a contradiction.

□

2.7. **Profile decomposition and the end of proof for Proposition 2.3.** In this Subsection, under Assumption 1, we use profile decomposition on the Euclidean space to construct the minimizer v.

We first make a simple observation, $\{u_k\}_k$ can be viewed as a bounded sequence in $H^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$, then up to picking subsequence, we may assume $\{u_k\}$ admits a profile decomposition with $\{v_j; \{\lambda_{j,k}\}_k\}_j$ in the sense of Lemma 1.9. We will show one profile actually gives the minimizer.

Without loss of generality we may assume there are only three types of profiles:

- type (a): Profile v_j such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \lambda_{j,k} = \infty$.
- type (b): Profile v_j such that $\lambda_{j,k} \equiv 1$ for all k.
- type (c): Profile v_j such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \lambda_{j,k} = 0$.

Note there is at most one profile of type (b), since

$$j \neq j' \Longrightarrow \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\lambda_{j,k}}{\lambda_{j',k}} + \frac{\lambda_{j',k}}{\lambda_{j,k}} = +\infty.$$

We first show

Lemma 2.9. *Type (a) profiles do not exist.*

Proof. We will focus on the function spaces $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ and $L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)$. The proof is by contradiction. Suppose v_1 is a profile of type (a), if $v_1 \neq 0$, then there is $R0 > 0, \epsilon_0 > 0$, such that

$$\|v_1 1_{\frac{1}{R_0}<|x|<R_0}\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} > \epsilon_0 \tag{2.20}$$

Now let χ be some smooth bump function

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & 1/R_0 \leq |x| \leq R_0, \\ 0, & |x| \leq 1/(2R_0) \text{ or } |x| \geq 2R_0, \end{cases}$$

Then by the property of profile decomposition,

$$\|\chi(x/\lambda_{1,k})u_k)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,k}} v_1 \left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{1,k}}\right) \chi\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{1,k}}\right) \right\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} + o_k(1) \equiv \|\chi v_1\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} + o_k(1). \tag{2.21}$$

Since u_k is bounded in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ and using pointwise control from the Hardy inequality (Lemma (A.1)), we obtain

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \sup_k \|u_k 1_{|x|\geq R}\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0,$$

which is clearly a contradiction to (2.21), since $\lim_{k\to\infty} \lambda_{1,k} = \infty$. □

We then show

Lemma 2.10. *Type (c) profile does not exist .*

Proof. One argues line by line as in Lemma 2.9, and ends up with

$$\|\chi(x/\lambda_{1,k})u_k)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = \left\| \frac{1}{\lambda_{1,k}} v_1 \left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{1,k}}\right) \chi\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_{1,k}}\right) \right\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} + o_k(1) \equiv \|\chi v_1\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} + o_k(1). \tag{2.22}$$

This indicates there exists $R_k \to \infty$, such that for large k, $\|\chi(R_k x)u_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} > \epsilon > 0$ for some ϵ, which is equivalent to $\|\chi(R_k x)u_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} > \epsilon_1 > 0$ for some ϵ_1, a contradiction to Lemma 2.6. □

Only two possibility are left now.

- **Case 1**: There are no non-trivial profiles, i.e.
$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \to 0. \tag{2.23}$$
- **Case 2**: There is one nontrivial profile v, i.e. u admits a profile decomposition:
$$u_k = v + r_k \tag{2.24}$$
where $r_k \rightharpoonup 0$ in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|r_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0$.

We first exclude Case 1. By Lemma 2.5, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a compactly supported cut-off function χ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k - \chi u_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \leq \epsilon. \tag{2.25}$$

Meanwhile, since χ is compact supported, we have

$$\|\chi u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} \lesssim \|\chi u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|\chi u_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} \lesssim \|u_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)}. \tag{2.26}$$

However we have assumed that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0$ and so (2.25) and (2.26) imply $\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$, which clearly contradicts

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} > m_0 > 0,$$

see Lemma 2.4.

Now the only possibility is **Case 2**. We again fix some bump function

$$\chi = \begin{cases} 1, |x| \leq 1, \\ 0, |x| \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

We first observe that although profile decomposition only ensures $v \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3) \cap L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)$, we can actually show $v \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$.

Indeed, u_k weakly converges to v in $\dot{H}^1(\mathbf{R}^3)$ (which of course implies weak convergence in $L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)$). And u_k is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$. Thus v must be in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$. In particular, r_k is also uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$.

Furthermore, we claim:

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|r_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0. \tag{2.27}$$

Indeed, for any R, we have $r_k = r_k\chi(\frac{x}{R}) + (1-\chi(\frac{x}{R}))r_k$. By $\lim_{k\to\infty}\|r_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{R}^3)} = 0$, we get for any R fixed

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left\|\chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) r_k\right\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0. \tag{2.28}$$

Since r_k is uniformly bounded in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$, we can apply the Hardy inequality (Lemma A.1) to see

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \sup_k \left\|\left(1-\chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right)\right) u_k\right\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0, \tag{2.29}$$

and (2.27) clearly follows from (2.28) and (2.29).
Now we show the following orthogonality property

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} (v, r_k)_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0. \tag{2.30}$$

Since $v \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$ and $\{r_k\}_k$ is a bounded sequence in $H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$, we can always use a sequence $v_n \in C_c^\infty$ to approximate v. Therefore we need only show that for any $w \in C_c^\infty$ we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} (w, r_k)_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0, \tag{2.31}$$

This directly follows from (2.27) since

$$(w, r_k)_{H^1} = \int_{\mathbf{H}^3} ((-1+\Delta_{\mathbf{H}^3})w) r_k.$$

A similar argument shows that for any R, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) v, \chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) r_k\right)_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0. \tag{2.32}$$

Next, note that $v \in \bar{\Omega}/0$.

We want to show $J(v) \le \frac{1}{2} - \delta_0 \equiv \lim_{k\to\infty} J(u_k)$. From the view point of Lemma 2.5, we need only show for all $R > 0$

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} J\left(\chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) u_k\right) \ge \lim_{k\to\infty} J\left(\chi\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) v\right). \tag{2.33}$$

(One may need to replace by a subsequence to ensure the limit exists.)

Since $\|r_k\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} \xrightarrow{k} 0$, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} E(\chi(\frac{x}{R})r_k) \ge 0, \lim_{k\to\infty} \|\chi(\frac{x}{R})r_k\|_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0,$$

and since $u_k = v + r_k$ (2.33) clearly follows. This concludes the proof.

We remark the above argument actually shows $\lim_{k\to\infty}\|r_k\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0$ and implies

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k - v\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0. \tag{2.34}$$

3. Acknowledgment

We thank Gigliola Staffilani for consistent support, helpful discussion and careful reading of the material. Part of this work was done in MIT summer SPUR program 2014, we thank Pavel Etingof and David Jerison for helpful discussion. Part of this work was done while Chenjie Fan was in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during Fall 2015 semester, under the support of NSF Grant No. 0932078000.

Appendix A. A collection of technical lemmas

Lemma A.1. *For any $u \in H^1_{rad}(H^3)$,*

$$|u(r)| \lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{4}r}, \forall r \geq 10. \tag{A.1}$$

Proof. We believe the result is classical and the power we get here is not optimal. We include a quick proof for the reader's convenience. Without loss of generality we assume $\|u\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 1$ and we show $|u(r_0)| \lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{4}r_0}, \forall r_0 \geq 10$. Indeed, since u is radial and $\|u\|_{H^1}(\mathbf{H}^3) = 1$, one immediately gets

$$\int_0^\infty (|\partial_r u(r)|^2 + |u(r)|^2) \sinh^2 r dr \lesssim 1 \tag{A.2}$$

The idea is to view u as a function on $\mathbf{R}$, we will rely on the usual one dimensional Sobolev embedding $H^1(\mathbf{R}) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\mathbf{R})$.
Indeed, let $\chi(x)$ be some smooth bump function on $\mathbf{R}$, such that

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, |x| \leq 1, \\ 0, |x| \geq 2. \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

Then one immediately obtains

$$\int_{\mathbf{R}} |\chi(r - r_0)u(r)|^2 + |\partial_r(\chi(r - r_0)u(r))|^2 \sinh^2 r dr \lesssim 1. \tag{A.4}$$

Furthermore by (A.4), one gets

$$\|\chi(r - r_0)u(r)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbf{R})} \lesssim \|\chi(r - r_0)u(r)\|_{H^1(\mathbf{R})} \lesssim (\sinh(r_0 - 2))^{-1} \lesssim e^{-\frac{3}{4}r_0}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma A.2. *For any bounded sequence $\{f_k\}_k$ in $H^1_{rad}(\mathbf{H}^3)$, we have*

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \sup_k \|1_{|x|\geq R} f_k(x)\|_{L^6(\mathbf{H}^3)} = 0. \tag{A.5}$$

Lemma A.2 directly follows from Lemma A.1.

Lemma A.3. *$\forall \sigma > 0$, there exists $\epsilon > 0$, such that for all $f \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3), f \neq 0$*

$$\|f\|_{H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)} \leq \epsilon \Longrightarrow J(f) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \sigma \tag{A.6}$$

Proof. Essentially, when f falls into the small data regime (i.e. $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f\|_{H^1} \leq \epsilon$), the L^6 part in the $J(f)$ can be neglected, and $J(f) \approx \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla_{\mathbf{H}^3} f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}/\|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbf{H}^3)}$, while the latter is not smaller than $\frac{1}{2}$ due to the spectral property of $-\Delta_{H^3}$.

□

Lemma A.4. *Given $R > 0$, and $R_k \to \infty$, $\epsilon > 0$, for any bounded sequence $\{f_k\}_k$ in $H^1_{rad}(H^3)$ one can always (up to replacement by a sub-sequence) find a decomposition*

$$f_k = f_{k,1} + f_{k,2} + r_k \tag{A.7}$$

such that for k large enough,

- $f_k = f_{k,1}$ *for* $|x| \leq R$
- $f_k = f_{k,2}$ *for* $|x| \geq R_k$
- $f_{k,1}$ *and* $f_{k,2}$ *do not have common support.*
- $f_{k,2}$ *vanishes for* $|x| \leq \widetilde{R}_k$, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \widetilde{R}_k = \infty$
- $\|r_k\|_{H^1(H^3)} \leq \epsilon$.

The proof is elementary and essentially the pigeonhole principle, see Section C.

Lemma A.5. *Given $R > 0$, and $R_k \to \infty$, $\epsilon > 0$, for any bounded sequence $\{f_k\}_k$ in $H^1_{rad}(H^3)$ one can always (up to replacement by a sub-sequence) find a decomposition*

$$f_k = f_{k,1} + f_{k,2} + r_k \tag{A.8}$$

such that for k large enough,

- $f_k = f_{k,1}$ *for* $|x| \geq R^{-1}$
- $f_k = f_{k,2}$ *for* $|x| \leq R_k^{-1}$
- $f_{k,1}$ *and* $f_{k,2}$ *do not have common support.*
- $f_{k,2}$ *vanishes for* $x \geq \widetilde{R}_k^{-1}$, $\widetilde{R}_k \to \infty$.
- $\|r_k\|_{H^1(H^3)} \leq \epsilon$.

The proof is essentially the pigeonhole principle, and the argument is similar to that of (A.4).

Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 1.11

We show how to upgrade Lemma 1.10 to Lemma 1.11.

Proof. With Lemma 1.10, we need only to show that if some $u(x) \in H^1(\mathbf{H}^3)$, $u(x) \geq 0$ and $u(x_0) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbf{H}^3$, then $u \equiv 0$.

First, by classical elliptic regularity theory ([Tru68]), one has that u is smooth. Now, since u is radial, $u(x) = u(r)$, we have for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$

$$u_{rr} + 2\coth r u_r = -u^5 + \lambda u. \tag{B.1}$$

Note if at some r_0, $u(r_0) = 0$, then we must also have $u_r(r_0) = 0$ since at r_0 the nonnegative function u obtains its minimal value. Since (B.1) is a second order ordinary differential equation, this implies $u \equiv 0$.

The case $r_0 = 0$ warrants special discussion, as at first glance the equation (B.1) appears singular. However, since u is smooth, u is infinitely differentiable at $r_0 = 0$ and one easily deduces that $u(0) = 0, u_r(0) = 0$ and $u_{rr}(0) = 0$. Therefore (B.1) is not singular at 0 and one still gets $u \equiv 0$. □

Appendix C. Proof of Lemma A.4

Proof. This section is devoted to the proof of Lemma A.4. Let us assume $R \sim 2^{j_0}, R_k \sim 2^{j_k}$, where j_0, j_k are integers. Since R is fixed and $\lim_{k\to\infty} R_k = \infty$,

we have $\lim_{k\to\infty} j_k - j_0 = \infty$. Thus, by pigeonhole principle, (note $\|f_k\|_{H^1(H^3)}$ is bounded), when k is large enough, we will be able to find $j_0 \ll l_k \ll j_k$, such that

$$\|f_k\|_{H^1(H^3)} \leq \epsilon/1000. \tag{C.1}$$

Then, simply do a (smooth) cut off at at $|x| \sim 2^{l_k}$, and one will obtain the desired decomposition. To be precise, let

$$\chi_{k,1} = \begin{cases} 1, |x| \leq 2^{l_k}, \\ 0, |x| \geq 2^{l_k+1/2}. \end{cases} \tag{C.2}$$

$$\chi_{k,2} = \begin{cases} 1, |x| \geq 2^{l_k+1}, \\ 0, |x| \leq 2^{l_k+1/2}. \end{cases} \tag{C.3}$$

and let

$$f_{k,1} = f\chi_{k,1}, \quad f_{k,2} = f\chi_{k,2}, \quad r_k = f - f_{k,1} - f_{k,2}. \tag{C.4}$$

□

References

[Aub76] Thierry Aubin. Espaces de sobolev sur les variétés riemanniennes. *Bull. Sci. Math*, 2(100):2, 1976.

[Ban07] Valeria Banica. The nonlinear schrödinger equation on hyperbolic space. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 32(10):1643–1677, 2007.

[BD14] Valeria Banica and Thomas Duyckaerts. Global existence, scattering and blow-up for the focusing nls on the hyperbolic space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.0846*, 2014.

[Gér98] Patrick Gérard. Description du défaut de compacité de l'injection de sobolev. *ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, 3:213–233, 1998.

[Heb00] Emmanuel Hebey. *Nonlinear analysis on manifolds: Sobolev spaces and inequalities*, volume 5. American Mathematical Soc., 2000.

[IPS12] Alexandru Ionescu, Benoît Pausader, and Gigliola Staffilani. On the global well-posedness of energy-critical schrödinger equations in curved spaces. *Analysis & PDE*, 5(4):705–746, 2012.

[Ker01] Sahbi Keraani. On the defect of compactness for the strichartz estimates of the schrödinger equations. *Journal of Differential equations*, 175(2):353–392, 2001.

[KM06] Carlos E Kenig and Frank Merle. Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, non-linear schrödinger equation in the radial case. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 166(3):645–675, 2006.

[MS08] Gianni Mancini and Kunnath Sandeep. On a semilinear elliptic equation in hn. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa–Classe di Scienze*, 7(4):635–671, 2008.

[Tru68] Neil S Trudinger. Remarks concerning the conformal deformation of riemannian structures on compact manifolds. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze*, 22(2):265–274, 1968.